Kamil Kopij

The Context and Dating of the Pompey's Aureus (RRC 402)[1]

La datazione dell'aureo RRC 402, uno dei rari esempi di emissione romana ad opera di Pompeo Magno, costituisce ancor oggi un problema cronologico di non facile soluzione. Le varie ipotesi finora proposte dagli studiosi oscillano infatti tra l'81 e il 46 a.C.
Riesaminando singolarmente gli elementi iconografici raffigurati su ambo i lati della moneta nel contesto più ampio della monetazione antica d'epoca ellenistica l'autore giunge a formulare, scartandone altre, una nuova ipotesi di identificazione del particolare contesto storico nel quale l'aureo RRC 402 fu emesso.

I. Introduction

During his long career Pompey the Great had little opportunities to mint coins. As a result, in the course of his life his name appeared only on three issues. Even at the war with Caesar he did not find it necessary to dominate coinage struck in the Senate's camp with his «signature»[2]. Therefore, the correct dating and interpretation of the few types is of paramount importance for the study of the coinage of the Late Roman Republic. The most well-known coin bearing the name Pompeius Magnus is an *aureus*[3] (fig. 1). Its prominence was earned due to an unprecedented – for Pompey – clarity of references to his triumphs. However, the rarity of the coin and the difficulty with the dating have led to serious problems with

Fig. 1
Aureus of Pompey the Great (RRC 402),
© Trustees of the British Museum (20 mm).

an interpretation of imagery and its meaning. This study will reexamine the available evidence concerning the Pompey's *aureus* and argue for two proposals that are usually ignored by the scholars when it comes to dating the issue.

II. The Pompey's Aureus

The obverse of the *aureus* depicts a female head wearing elephant's skin. Usually the figure is interpreted as the first personification of Africa in the Roman art. The female head is flanked by a jug and a *lituus* – the symbols of augurate. Behind the head the moneyer placed the inscription reading «MAGNVS» which is a clear reference to Pompey as the moneyer. The border of the obverse in form of a laurel wreath symbolise a triumph.

The reverse depicts a scene from a triumphal procession. The composition consists of a triumphal chariot driven by the triumphant himself, a horseman and a flying figure of Victory. The rider is usually interpreted as Gnaeus, Pompey's son[4], for it is believed that children of a triumphant often participated in a procession by their father's side in the chariot or on horseback. Beneath, in exergue, the phrase «PRO·COS» denotes the general's proconsular power.

The lack of precise dating constitutes a major impediment for the interpretation of the *aureus'* imagery. Only five specimen of the *aureus* are known[5] and none of them has been found in an archaeological context that could help us to date it. Therefore, the estimates of the year of its production vary from 81 to 46[6].

The most obvious dating of the coin based on the triumphal scene depicted on the obverse would be the time of the first triumph of the general in 81[7] celebrating his victories in Africa. This would corroborate with the interpretation of the female figure on the obverse as personification of Africa. Also, Pompey was just 25 years old at the time and therefore more likely to brag about his extraordinary victories by minting a gold piece[8]. However, Crawford[9] ruled out this date rightly observing that during the war on Sicily and in Africa Pompey did not possess the proconsular *imperium* mentioned in the legend on the reverse[10]. Furthermore, Plutarch[11] says that Pompey had not used the cognomen *Magnus* before the conclusion of the war with Sertorius in Spain in 72[12]. Also if the opinion of Castritius[13] that Pompey was not co-opted into the *collegium augures* before his first consulship was true, the presence of augural attributes on the obverse of the coin suggests the *aureus* cannot predate 71. Although we must remember that this date is far from being certain, therefore Pompey might have become an *augur* earlier.

On the basis of a stylistic analysis of the images Crawford[14] estimated that the *aureus* was minted in 71 suggesting that Pompey struck the coin on the occasion of his second triumph[15] – the one officially over Spain but in reality over his fellow citizen, Sertorius. The victory over Sertorius was a conclusion of the long war between the Marians and the Sullans. Therefore, the personification of Africa on the obverse of the coin could be a reminder of his earlier victories over the Marians during the African campaign. Battenberg[16] argues that Pompey referred to his previous brilliant victories because the campaign against Sertorius was less glorious[17]. Also according to the German scholar, the general wanted to remind the deeds that brought him a honorific title – and soon a by-name – of *Magnus*.

However, several lines of evidence indicate that this interpretation is erroneous. Having ended the armed conflict Pompey also burned all the correspondence between Sertorius and his supporters in Rome to avoid a future bloodshed[18]. Thus, it is hard to imagine that he so eagerly to conclude the civil war and try to forget it would at the same time use a widely disseminated coin that reminded the people of his previous involvement. In addition, placing the personification of Africa on the obverse of his *aureus* would also undermine his attempts to present the conflict with Sertorius as an external war with the Spaniards[19]. Finally, although Sertorius used the help of his African allies it would be strange to exaggerate their participation to the point of depicting the personification of Africa and not Spain on the coin.

As we can see the interpretation of the coin imagery in the context of the date proposed by Crawford is not fully satisfactory. Furthermore, it does not explain the presence of the horseman in the triumphal scene depicted on the reverse of the coin as Pompey's elder son – Pompey the Younger. Although the exact date of Pompey the Younger's birth is not known it is generally believed that it happened *ca.* 75[20]. In 71 he would be too young to accompany his father on horseback, although he could ride with him in the chariot. Of course the scene placed on the obverse is not a representation of the real triumph in every detail as the figure of flying Victory clearly shows. Thus, the presence of Pompey's son on a horseback cannot be regarded as an unequivocal evidence against dating the coin to 71.

The next opportunity for minting a coin depicting a triumph came to Pompey in 61[21] after his victory in the East[22]. Celebrating his third triumph Pompey became the first Roman who was granted this distinction for victories gained on three different continents. If the *aureus* was minted to record Pompey's third triumph the personification of Africa on the obverse could serve as a reminder of his previous deeds. In fact, Castritius[23] wondered if the *aureus* was not a part of a series of coins commemorating all triumphs of Pompey. However, he rejects this idea as very improbable because it would mean that the issues dedicated to the Spanish and the Asian triumphs have not survived to our times. The fact that three different dies of the «African coin» are known makes this idea even less plausible.

Usually it is believed that Pompey minted the *aurei* to dispense them among his soldiers and/or civilians who witnessed the triumphal procession. This led L. Amela Valverde[24]

to suggest that the gold coins were struck as part of handout Pompey made to the soldiers that had participated in the eastern campaigns[25]. Therefore, the coin could have been minted in the East, specifically in Amisos, Pontus. Indeed, as the coin seems as a private issue[26], it raises the question whether Pompey was able to afford the minting before the financially advantageous conquest of the East.

Despite the fact that economically it seems more plausible for the coin to be struck in 61 than in 71, some scholars[27] have also raised the question whether the political position of Pompey at the time was high enough to mint a coin. For Castritius[28] lack of other issues referring to Pompey during that period suggests that it was not. There is no doubt that with the disbandment of his army after returning to Italy[29] Pompey's political power diminished significantly. However, none of the arguments stand up to closer scrutiny. First, even during the peak of Pompey's political influence, coins referring to him are rare. For example, there are just two coins undoubtedly referring to Pompey struck before the outbreak of the civil war with Caesar, both minted by his son-in-law Faustus Sulla[30]. Second, the weakening of one's political position does not decrease the amount of his or her propaganda effort. On the contrary, the time and resources put into personal branding increase during the times of unpopularity. This is an evident trend for Pompey as well. Shortly after his return to Rome he began to erect a complex known as the Theatre of Pompey or the *Opera Pompei*[31] aimed at boosting his prestige and influence. According to Pliny[32] he also consecrated a shrine of Minerva – possibly *Minerva victrix* – from the spoils of war[33]. Finally, there is a possibility that at the time the general built or restored the temple of *Hercules invictus ad circum maximum*, called sometimes the temple of *Hercules pompeianus*[34], though we are not sure when exactly he dedicated it. Nevertheless, if Pompey could have begun the construction of the *Opera Pompei* and erected the shrine of Minerva, he clearly had the money and the drive to extend his influence and bolster his reputation. Therefore, nothing stood in the way of minting the *aurei* at that time. Thus, the sole obstacle to date the coin to 61 is the interpretation of the female figure on the obverse as a personification of Africa.

The next possible, although rather unlikely scenario concerns the Theatre of Pompey itself. The coin could have been minted in the year of the spectacular inauguration of the complex during Pompey's second consulship in 55[35]. The monumental character of this foundation and its sculptural decoration[36] were intended to emphasize the splendour of the founder's achievements[37]. Therefore, it is possible that the opening ceremony was accompanied by a distribution of the gold coins bearing Pompey's image as a tangible reminder of the event as well as of his triumphs.

Finally, the personification of Africa on the obverse of the coin prompted some scholars[38] to date it to the time of the civil war with Caesar. The similarity of the inscriptions «MAGNVS» (on the obverse) and «PRO COS» (on the reverse) of the *aureus* and the legend «MAGN PRO COS» on the coins of Piso (fig. 2)[39] and Varro (fig. 3)[40] is considered indicative of this late date. Thus, if Alföldi's[41] suggestion that Piso and Varro minted their coins in Africa,

Fig. 2
Denarius of Pompey the Great and Gn. Piso (RRC 446),
© Trustees of the British Museum (18 mm).

Fig. 3
Denarius of Pompey the Great and Varro (RRC 447),
© Trustees of the British Museum (19 mm).

rather than in Spain is correct, it would indicate the place. Those who postulate African origin of the coins, usually point Utica as the most probable location of the mint[42]. However, it is hard to imagine why the Pompeians in Africa would use the image of triumph especially after the disastrous battle of Pharsalos[43]. Castritius[44] tries to explain the presence of triumphal scene by emphasising the importance of the rider accompanying Pompey and arguing that the prime goal of the reverse was to show Pompey's son as his heir (he adopts his father's byname of Magnus) and a guarantor of a future victory. This notion does not seem likely. Moreover, the coin is slightly heavier[45] than other *aurei* at that time, i.e. the gold coins of Caesar[46]. Despite the fact that the weight of particular specimens varies it seems that the coin of Pompey (with the weight of approximately 1/36 of a *libra*)[47] falls between Sulla's *aurei* (approx. 1/30 of a *libra*) and those minted by Caesar (approx. 1/38 of a *libra* in the case of RRC 451 and then 1/40 of a *libra*)[48]. Based on the trends in coins weights the best estimation of the *aureus'* dating would be somewhere between 80 and 47, probably closer to the latter. Of course, the relationship between coin weights and their dating is rarely straightforward.

III. Head with elephant's skin and elephant in numismatic

During the period of the Roman imperial art a female figure wearing an elephant's skin was meant as a personification of Africa[49]. Yet, since the head on the Pompey's coin is the first known representation of the sort and, therefore, the general is considered as a creator of the type, it is worth examining where the inspiration could have come from.

A. The earliest examples

The earliest examples of the coins depicting head wrapped in elephant skin are: a tetradrachm of Ptolemy I[50], a double gold decadrachm of Agathocles (*Ἀγαθοκλῆς*)[51] of Syracuse and possibly a silver coin of Panormus[52].

The earliest image image of a head wrapped in *exuviæ elephantis* comes from a tetradrachm struck by Ptolemy I ca. 320-315[53] (fig. 4). Contrary to the later imagery and despite the claims made by Toynbee[54] who argued that it was a symbol of Ptolemy's right to rule over Africa, the figure is not a personification of Africa but the tetradrachm portrays Alexan-

Fig. 4
Tetradrachm of Ptolemy I (Svoronos 33v),
© Bradley J. Bowin, M.D. (24 mm).

der the Great. The elephant's skin is also interpreted as an allusion to Dionysos[55]. In this case Alexander would be a *νέος Διόνυσος* (*néos Diónysos*) who, like the god, conquered India and returned triumphant. Stewart[56] argued that Ptolemy could not referred to the Indian campaign of Alexander since at that time the East was a dominion of Seleucus. However, each of the *diadochi*, including Ptolemy, aimed at extending the territory he controlled and establishing himself as true heir to Alexander's legacy. Therefore, the portrait of the late king was an expression of the desire to succeed him, especially as Ptolemy was in possession of Alexander's body.

Stewart[57] indicated that the connection between Dionysos and elephant was most probably not made prior to the rule of Ptolemy II, who inaugurated his succession in 285 with the so-called Great Procession in honour of Dionysos[58]. The attribution of an *exuviæ elephantis* to Dionysos was never very popular as we can see from the examples of two other *νέοι Διονύσοι* (*néoi Dionýsoi*) – Ptolemy XIII and Mithridates the Great[59] who – at least to our knowledge – did not use it. This has led Stewart[60] to suggest that Ptolemy deified Alexander and by decorating his head with the elephant's skin he aimed to make an analogy to Hercules and his lion's skin as well as Dionysos and his leopard's skin. Alexander's single combat with Porus on an elephant would be the sign of an extraordinary *ἀρετή* (*areté*) akin to the Hercules' victory in the fight with Nemean lion. Stewart concludes that Ptolemy tried to show Alexander as a heir to Hercules and the *exuviæ elephantis* was a symbol of «the invincible world conqueror, whose mortal remains now rested within his own territory[61]». Finally, Stewart argues that the selection of elephant's skin had an additional meaning: wearing it was a sign of divinity since only the divine head could match a much bigger elephant's skull[62].

There is a small chance that Ptolemy was not the first one to use a depiction of a head with an elephant-scalp. There is a unique silver coin attributed to Panormus in Sicily and dated to the first half of 4th century in the Copenhagen Nationalmuseet[63]. However, both the attribution and dating are based on stylistic grounds and remain highly uncertain, especially as the presence of elephants in Sicily is not recorded prior to the mid-third century[64]. The battle of Panormus, when Metellus captured a substantial number of the Carthaginian elephants introducing his fellow countrymen ti the previously unknown animal, took place in 251[65]. Thus, it is unlikely that city officials would mint a coin with *exuviæ elephantis* before this event[66]. Several other attributions and dating of the coin were considered by Maritz[67] who discussed placing the mint in Clazomenae, attributing the coin to Numidian or Mauretanian kings or relating it to the *gens Metella*. A possibility of a forgery has also not been excluded[68].

Fig. 5
Stater of Agathocles of Syracuse,
© Numismatica Ars Classica NAC AG, Auction 13, lot 511 (17 mm).

The disambiguity in the dating of the "Danish" coin makes it difficult to interpret the *exuviæ elephantis* depicted on it.

The next coin depicting a head wearing an elephant's skin was struck in Syracuse by Agathokles (*Ἀγαθοκλῆς*)[69] (fig. 5). The double gold decadrachm was most probably minted between 314 and 305. According to Toynbee[70] the representation on the obverse is the first personification of Africa in ancient art and refers to the African expedition of Agathokles in 310. Maritz[71] disagrees with this interpretation pointing out the striking similarity the Ptolemy's Alexander tetradrachm. The interpretation of the coin as a reference to the legend of Alexander is further supported by the strong political link between Ptolemy and Agathocles – the husband of his stepdaughter Theoxena (*Θεόξενα*). Furthermore, neither Agathokles nor the Carthaginians used elephants in the warfare. As mentioned before the *Pœni* introduced them in the mid-third century[72]. Therefore, it is unlikely that Agathokles would use an elephant skin as the personification of Africa or Libya on his coin. Finally, the portraits of Agathocles derived from other coins minted by him differ significantly from that on the decadrachm[73]. Therefore, of all the possible interpretations[74] – the personification of Africa, Libya or Sicily as well as the portrait of Agathocles or Alexander – the last seems to be the most probable[75].

B. African Representations

There are a few examples of «African» coins depicting a head wrapped in elephant skin: a bronze coin attributed to the Numidian king Hierbaes[76], Metellus Scipio and Eppius' *denarius*[77] (fig. 6), Juba's coin[78] (fig. 7), Bogud's coin[79] (fig. 8), L. Cestius and C. Norbanus' *aureus*[80] (fig. 9), Q. Cornuficius' *denarius*[81] (fig. 10) Bocchus'[82] coin and finally numerous pieces of Juba II[83].

The earliest coin with a head wearing *exuviæ elephantis* struck in Africa is a bronze coin often attributed to the Numidian king Hierbas[84]. However, both the attribution and the dating are highly uncertain. Maritz[85] pointed out that even if Hierbas did mint coins as a king of the *Massyli* he could not have known the concept of Africa as a female figure wrapped in the elephant skin[86]. Even if we exercise the possibility that the concept of Africa was known to the king, the interesting problem remains: where did Hierbas take the idea of the elephant's skin from? Ptolemaic coins could have been a source of inspiration[87], but it seems more likely

Fig. 6
Denarius of Metellus Scipio and Eppius (RRC 461/1),
© Trustees of the British Museum (18 mm).

that the coins are later and the concept of Africa as well as its representation in form of a head wearing *exuviæ elephantis* were introduced by the Romans at much later date.

Another «African» coin was struck by Metellus Scipio and Eppius in 47-46[88] (fig. 6). In fact it is the first coin featuring an indisputable personification of Africa. This certainty of interpretation comes from attributes that accompany the representation, i.e. corn ears and a plough – two symbols traditionally representing the fertility of the province[89]. Although it is often being compared to the *aureus* of Pompey, the representation differs in many stylistic details[90]. Maritz[91] postulates that this personification of Africa in the Roman art that was almost instantly absorbed and used by the Numidian and the Mauretanian kings – Juba I[92] (fig. 7) and Bogud[93] (fig. 8) whose power struggles where closely connected with the Romans.

The 40s were no doubt the time when the concept of the personification of Africa solidified. Shortly after Metellus Scipio's coin in 43 L. Cestius and C. Norbanus struck – probably in Rome – an *aureus*[94] with a female head wearing an elephant's skin (fig. 9) and in 42 the governor of Africa Q. Cornuficius minted a *denarius*[95] with a bust representing the province on the obverse (fig. 10). The latter is potentially related to the Pompeian tradition[96] as Cornuficius helped Sextus Pompey in his attempts to gain control of Sicily[97]. A different set of coins depicting a female wearing an elephant headdress were struck by Numidian and Mauretanian kings – Bocchus[98] (ca. 33-25) and Juba II[99] (ca. 25 BC-AD 23). This evidence corroborates with the conclusion of Maritz that the image of the personification of Africa was not indigenous to North

Fig. 7
Bronze coin of Juba I (CNNM 93),
© Classical Numismatic Group,
INC. www.cngcoins.com/ (26 mm).

Fig. 8
Silver coin of Bogud I (RPC 853),
© Classical Numismatic Group,
INC. www.cngcoins.com/ (19 mm).

Fig. 9
Aureus of L. Norbanus and C. Cestius (RRC 491/1),
© Trustees of the British Museum (20 mm).

Fig. 10
Denarius of Q. Cornuficius (RRC 509/4),
© Trustees of the British Museum (18 mm).

Africa but was introduced by the Romans. Both Bocchus and Juba II tied themselves very closely with the Romans and wanted to confirm and extend their rule by getting involved with different Roman parties. Finally Juba II reached the goal of uniting Numidia and Mauretania under his power thanks to Octavian's support. It is no wonder, therefore, that he used the personification of Africa to show himself as a sole ruler of «Roman Africa». Latin inscription REX IVBA confirms that the coin was first and foremost intended for the Romans and rather than the locals.

At times of the Julio-Claudian dynasty the figure of a woman wearing the *exuviæ elephantis* appears on just one coin. It was struck in Alexandria[100] during the reign of Nero and, therefore, cannot be interpreted as a personification of Africa. Nonetheless, the same image occurs in other classes of artefacts, e.g., in sculpture, mosaic, frescoes and gems[101]. However, despite the fact that the personifications of Africa were not rare in the first century AD the images significantly differ from each other[102]. Thus, it is safe to assume that «the language of personifications» including the one of Africa was not solidified before the reigns of Trajan and Hadrian in the first half of the second century AD[103].

Before moving on to Asia it is worth to mention that not only the image of the head with *exuviæ elephantis* but also that of an elephant or its *protome* is represented in numismatic evidence from Africa[104]. They will not be discussed here, because they are of less relevance to the subject.

C. Asian Representations

The image of elephant appears freqently not only in African context but also in Asian art. Let us go back for a moment to Alexander's duel with Porus[105] and the coin commemorating it[106] (fig. 11). The pictorial representations on this coin as well as several others minted by Alexander[107] refer to India, and more particularly to Alexander's Indian campaign (although other alternatives[108] have also been proposed). Equally, Alexanders coin with a representation of an elephant on the reverse and an Indian bowman on the obverse[109], and his other coin with a chariot and archer (probably Indian bowman too)[110] on the obverse and two men riding an elephant on the reverse[111] allude to the same military campaign.

Fig. 11
Decadrachm of Alexander the Great,
© A.H Baldwin and Sons (34 mm).

Soon after the emission of the Ptolemy's tetradrachm with Alexander in elephant headdress, Seleucus started striking his own versions of that portrait on a Persian daric[112] (fig. 12) and on a gold *statēr*[113]. Seleucus (*Σέλευκος*) also decorated in a similar way coins in other denominations[114]. After that there was a significant chronological gap before another *exuviæ elephantis* appeared again in the Seleucid coinage. In the 2nd century Demetrius I (*Δημήτριος Σωτήρ*) (fig. 13)[115], Demetrius II (*Δημήτριος Νικάτωρ*)[116] and Alexander II (*Ἀλέξανδρος Ζαβίνας*)[117] placed their own portraits with elephant headdresses on the coins. An even more interesting issue in this context is the bronze coin of Antioch III (*Ἀντίοχος Μέγας*)[118]. It referred most likely to the Eastern campaign of the king conducted in 209-204 and, contrary to the previous coins neither Alexander nor the issuer (Antioch III) was shown on the coin. Instead it seems that it depicted a female head with an elephant headdress. The coin could have be an important influence for the Pompey's *aureus* as it constitutes the first representation of a female head with an *exuviæ elephantis*. However, it is hard to interpret Antioch's coin. Despite the fact that personifications were known in the Hellenistic world[119] it is hard to see why the Seleucid king would show a personification of «the East» or India in this manner. It is nevertheless clear that the eastern parts of Alexander's dominion were important for the Seleucids and all kinds of references to elephants[120] were an expression of that[121].

The final confirmation that in the Hellenistic era an elephant referred to «the East» or India comes from the Bactrian coinage. Bactrian kings Demetrius I (*Δημήτριος Α΄*)[122] (fig. 14) and Lysias Aniketos (*Λυσίας ὁ Ἀνίκητος*)[123] (fig. 15) showed themselves wearing an ele-

Fig. 12
Double Daric of Seleucus I (SC 101),
© Classical Numismatic Group,
INC. www.cngcoins.com/ (23 mm).

Fig. 13
Bronze coin of Demetrius I (SC 1696),
© Ancient Imports,
http://www.ancientimports.com/ (23 mm).

Fig. 14
Drachm of Demetios I of Bactria,
© Classical Numismatic Group,
INC. www.cngcoins.com/ (16 mm).

Fig. 15
Drachm of Lysias Aniketos of Bactria,
© Classical Numismatic Group,
INC. www.cngcoins.com/ (15 mm).

phant headdress on coins. Also an elephant itself – and its head or *protome* – appears on coins of several other Bactrian rulers[124]. They probably partially emulated Alexander's coins mentioned above as well as Ptolemy's tetradrachms whilst referring to the Indian culture and its reverence for elephants. Finally, there are also a number of Indo-Scythian coins bearing elephants[125].

IV. Discussion

On the basis of the available evidence it seems that in the Hellenistic period an elephant was more frequently used as a symbol of India and in most cases *exuviæ elephantis* had nothing to do with the African continent nor its personification as it referred to Alexander the Great and his Indian campaign. It was most probably not before the second half of the first century BC that this image took on different meaning in the Roman culture due to increased rate of interaction with African rather than Indian elephants. Pompey's coin seems to be situated somewhere between the two traditions, being either an epigone of the Hellenistic meaning or at the forefront of the new Roman understanding of the *exuviæ elephantis*. Usually it has been seen as the later, being often called 'the first personification of Africa in the Roman art'. Only Maritz[126] and Amela Valverde[127] regard the image of the elephant headdress as referring to Alexander the Great. Maritz[128] concludes: «The attributes (a lituus and a jug) indicate the augurate, and the legend «MAGNVS», with its connotation to Alexander, refers specifically to Pompey who wanted to be associated with him, not the geographical area». Amela Valverde took one step further and equated the image with the portrait of the Macedonian king. Moreover, he argued that the coin was issued in Amisos after the end of the war with Mithridates and before Pompey's triumph in Rome[129]. As a result he links the coin with the third triumph of Pompey and rejects the idea that the image on the obverse should be regarded as a personification of Africa. It is possible that Pompey referred to Alexander as his youth's role model. However, the notion that Alexander himself was depicted on the *aureus* is controversial as the features of the portrait are not more feminine than masculine.

What exactly did Pompey have in mind may never be established but it is safe to assume that the general compared his Eastern campaign with Alexander's conquests and want-

ed to be perceived as the Roman Alexander at least in the East. What was essential to his propaganda was the fact that Pompey's soldiers reached regions where no Roman had gone before just like Alexander's soldiers had done a few centuries earlier. It is possible, therefore, that the female head with the *exuviæ elephantis* was intended as a personification of the East (or Asia) and the intention of Pompey was to depict a symbol of his extraordinary achievements in the East by referring to Alexander's campaigns.

Such claims would be considered to amount oneself above other members of the society. It may be helpful, therefore, to investigate whether there is other evidence for Pompey using other means to underline his 'exceptional' status.

First, in 63 two tribunes of the people Titus Ampius and Titus Labienus proposed to grant Pompey the extraordinary honours of *corona aurea* – a golden crown – and *toga prætexta* – a triumphal dress – which the general was allowed to wear during circus games and in the theatre. Pompey used these privileges only once, but since the people did not react well and he decided against using them again[130]. Nevertheless, the proposal of the tribunes was passed successfully and Pompey was elevated above other Romans with these insignia. In some sense the permission to wear the triumphal toga outside a triumphal procession made him a *triumphator perpetuus*, although the exact term was never used in reference to him[131]. It is possible that the golden crown was depicted on the reverse of Faustus Sulla's coin[132], which may be indicative of its importance to Pompey.

Second, we have plenty of epigraphical evidence that after his campaigns against the pirates and Mithridates Pompey received an extraordinary adoration in the East – particularly in Greece and in Asia Minor. For example, one of the inscriptions in the sanctuary of Apollo on Delos[133] was dedicated to the general by the citizens of Athens and their allies. It mentions the existence of *thíasos Pompeiastaí* (*θίασος Πομπηιασταὶ*) – a religious society formed probably *ca.* 67 in honour of the victorious general. This would constitute a sign of admiration without a precedent at least until the beginning of the principate[134] and indicates that Pompey was worshipped as a godlike being[135]. Commonly, he was referred to as a 'patron', 'benefactor' or 'saviour' of the city or of the whole Asia[136]. Although Pompey was not the first Roman worshipped in the East he was sometimes referred to as «the ruler of the land and the sea»[137]. This title had never been used before to refer to a Roman leader. Later it was widely used in dedications to the Roman emperors[138]. Moreover, some Cilician cities – Sóli-Pompeiópolis (*Σόλοι-Πομπηιούπολις*), Zephyrium (*Ζεφύριον*), Mopsuestia (*Μοψουεστία*), Alexandria (*Ἀλεξάνδρεια*)[139] – as well as a number of cities of Decapolis[140] adopted a new time scheme: 'the Pompeian Era' and started to count time according to it[141]. In Mytilene (*Μυτιλήνη*), where Pompey received a godlike cult, one of the months was named after him[142]. In Side he was announced an *isótheos (ἰσόθεος)*[143] – 'an equal to the gods'[144] – and in one of the cities of Locris – probably in Chalium – a priest of his cult was appointed[145]. Even if most of these honours were bestowed previously on other Roman generals operating in the East in no earlier case was the scale of the worship so vast and 'emperor-like'[146].

Third, a number of local Pontic and Bithynian coins from Amisos (*Αμισός*)[147], Nicaea (*Νίκαια*)[148], Nicomedia (*Νικομήδεια*)[149] and Prusa at Olympum (*Προῦσα πρὸς Ὀλύμπῳ τῷ ὄρει*)[150], have been interpreted by some scholars as a reference to Pompey as *Néos Diónysos*. All coins were signed by governors of the province Bithynia-Pontus: the first one by C. Caecilius Cornutus[151], the rest by C. Papirius Carbo[152]. Battenberg[153] argues that the coins depicting Roma sitting on the pile of shields[154], together with those showing Nike[155] referred to the war with Mithridates and were expressions of Pompey's and Rome's, victory. Moreover, he points out to the Dionysian themes appearing on the coins of Nicaea[156] which could also be a reference to Pompey as *Néos Diónysos* and a successor of Mithridates considered as an incarnation of this particular god[157]. According to Battenberg[158] Pompey was seen in Asia Minor as a successor of Mithridates – with his claims of being in possession of Alexander's *chlamys* – and thus a new Alexander who conquered the East and propagated Greek culture among the barbarians[159].

At the same time the aforementioned club of Heracles[160] referred to Pompey as an embodiment of the son of Zeus and Alcmene. This would corroborate with Pompey presenting himself as an heir to Alexander the Great – who combined in himself both Dionysos and Heracles[161]. However, similar themes are present in the coinage of the city in the imperial times indicating that this may have been just an expression of the local tradition.

The interpretation of the coins from Pontus and Bithynia is still controversial but it clearly shows that Pompey identify himself with Alexander the Great and was frequently referred to as an exceptional strategist and the superhuman conqueror of the East.

It is, therefore, not surprising that he might have placed an image clearly referring to Alexander as a conqueror of the East on this triumphal coin but not being bold enough to use his own portrait he replaced it with a female head wearing *exuviæ elephantis*.

V. Two hypotheses

A lot of emphasis has been put so far on the *context* of the Pompey's aureus. Nevertheless, there is still at least one more context that has not been fully explored – the political context of minting gold coins in the Late Roman Republic. Beside the *aureus* and one other coin – a *statḗr*[162], all the other gold issues were minted during the civil wars. The said *statḗr* was a commemorative issue dedicated to the governor Lentulus Marcellinus, not unlike the famous Flamininus' *statḗr*[163] and, therefore, belongs to a different tradition. Since all the other *aurei* were struck during the civil wars, perhaps we should consider the possibility that Pompey's coin was minted in under similar circumstances.

As described above, it is unlikely that the general minted his *aureus* when he served in Sicily and Africa since he only had a propraetorian *imperium* and not a proconsular one. Pompey was granted *imperium proconsulare* when he was appointed as one of commanders-in-chief in the war against Sertorius. The connection between minting the coin and the Spanish war was already made by Hill[164] who wrote: «The circumstances of the campaign[165]

might very naturally demand the issue of a military coinage in gold such as we have before us», and: «We are thus, it would appear, free to choose among the various available dates, and the period of the first Spanish proconsulship seems to have more in its favour than the rest». Recalling the first triumph by putting the personification of Africa on the obverse and a triumphal scene on the reverse would make a lot of sense if we assume that the coin was minted during, and not after, the war. If Pompey produced it on the occasion of the second triumph, he would probably decorate its obverse with a personification of Spain not Africa. Nevertheless, the question remains why would he mint a coin in the first place?

The struggle with Sertorius was a part of the civil war between the Marians and the Sullans. It did not give Pompey the right to struck his own coin. Pompey was supposed to get money to pay the troops and food supplies directly from Rome. Only he did not – the necessary financing never materialised despite letters to the Senate asking for additional supplies[166]. Some moderns[167] believe that the shortages Pompey wrote about were a deliberate attempt by his enemies – mainly Lucullus and the Metelli – to punish him and diminish his political position. Others[168] disagree pointing out that the Republic was not in a great shape at the time. Beside the struggles in Spain the Romans faced consular wars in the Balkans, the menace of Mithridates in Asia Minor and the unceasing activity of the pirates[169]. Moreover, grain shortages and the resulting rise in food prices caused riots in Rome[170]. Facing so many problems the Senate might have simply lacked sufficient funds and supplies to send it to Spain. Regardless of the exact cause Pompey was running short on supplies and had to use his own resources to finance the war. In a letter he complained: «I myself have exhausted not only my means, but even my credit»[171]. Thus, it is possible that as the funding provided by the Senate was inadequate to cover the full cost of the war, Pompey supplemented it by minting his own *aureii*. In similar cases silver coinage with the same design usually accompany the gold one. However, no siver issue that we could link with the *aureus* was found. It is possible though that Cnaeus Lentulus, Pompey's quaestor minted the *denarii*[172]. It is unlikely that the general would allow to put EX S.C on the coins that were issued from his own pocket, unless the coins were minted by the order of the Senate but their number was not sufficient to finance the war and Pompey had to use his own resources which he utilized to mint *aurei*.

Given the context and the imagery on the coin, dating Pompey's *aureus* to the war with Sertorius seems like a reasonable conclusion. However, it is worth to explore another possibility. The general took part in another civil war, the war with Caesar during which he was cut off from Rome. Moreover, he also failed to evacuate the state treasury that fell into the hands of Caesar. In these circumstances the anti-caesarian opposition wasted no time and started to mint coins immediately after reaching Greece. There are several issues we can link to 'the Senate faction' signed by the consuls of 49 and other officials[173]. Among them, two emissions with the name of Pompey[174]. Since both bear the «MAGN PRO COS» legend on reverses similar to that on the *aureus* (av: «MAGNVS»; rev: «PRO COS») they might have been minted at the same time. Issuing another coin may seem redundant in economical terms but it was definite-

ly plausible given the political context and the wide use of coins for propaganda. The Pompeians regularly exploited their greatest strengths in their propaganda, for example: Pompey the Great and the legality of their power highlighted by 'the consular emissions'. An *aureus* could have certainly been an addition to the propaganda toolset for a prestigious reasons. To our knowledge Caesar did not mint his own gold coin until at least 13 July 48[175]. This would explain why there are just five specimen known today. The emission was small because of its production started after 13 July 48 it was soon after disrupted by the battle of Pharsalos.

If the Pompey's *aureus* was minted during the last stages of the civil war with Caesar it is very unlikely that the imagery was linked to his African victories. In this case it should be interpreted as a manifestation of *imitatio Alexandri*. This is further supported by the fact that since the third Mithridatic war Pompey was regarded – and promoted – as the Roman Alexander in the Greek East.

VI. Conclusion

The *aureus* of Pompey the Great is one of the most elusive Roman coins. The lack of any archaeological context and ambiguous imagery hampered the efforts to date the coin. In this study, I propose that given the circumstances in which the Romans minted gold emissions in the late Republic, i.e civil wars, we can narrow down the many possibilities to just two. The two most popular among scholars alternatives date the coin to 71 or 61 BC. The former does not fit both contextual and iconographical analysis. The latter may be accepted in terms of imagery but not so much in terms of the context. There is no reason why Pompey would issue an *aureus* in 62 or 61 neither in the East nor in Rome. Therefore 76-75 or 48 should be regarded as strong possibilities, if not the most plausible dates, of the RRC 402 emission.

Footnotes

I thank Iza Romanowska for proofreading the draft of this article.

1 Study is a part of a project «*Auctoritas et dignitas*: the study of propaganda in the period of the Late Roman Republic on the example of the Pompey family (*gens Pompeia Magna*) in the light of archaeological and written sources» financed by the National Science Centre, Poland granted based on a decision no DEC-2012/07/N/HS3/000878.

2 Just two types (RRC 446 and RRC 447) out of at least six have Pompey's name on them. RRC 446 (fig. 2) and RRC 447 (fig. 3) were most probably produced by his legates in Spain or in Africa. Not having 'constitutional' opportunities Pompey to mint coins under his own name he used to exploit for his own purposes coins of *tresvíri monetáles* associated to him. Also the main theme of anti-caesarian propaganda was the legality of the government and therefore the illegality of Caesar's actions. To emphasize this point coins were signed mainly by consuls (RRC 445/1-3) and praetors (RRC 444).

3 RRC 402.

4 M.H. Crawford, *Roman Republican Coinage*, I, Cambridge 1974, 412-413 (I use Crawford (1974) for citing page or pages, RRC for types); M. Beard, *The Roman Triumph*, Cambridge-London 2007, 19-20.

5 G. Amisano, *L'oro di Roma dalle origini al 27 a.C.*, Cassino 2008, 45; L. Amela Valverde, *El áureo de Cn. Pompeyo Magno (RRC 402/1)*, «EspacioHist» 23, 2010, 206.

6 All dates B.C.

7 Livy, *Per*. 89; Gran.Lic.36.2; Eutrop.5.9.11; H. Mattingly, *Notes on Late Republican Coinage*, «NumChron» 3, 1963, 51; K.W. Harl, *Coinage in the Roman Economy 300 BC to AD. 700*, London (1996), 52.

8 Surly we can add that it was not

long after Sulla's own *aurei* and was following his tradition.

9 Crawford 1974, 412-413 (cf. note 4).

10 Gran.Lic.36.2; A. E. R. Boak, *The Extraordinary Commands from 80 to 48 B.C. A Study in the Origins of the Principate*, «The American Historical Review» 24, 1918, 3-4 (1-25); J. Van Ooteghem, *Pompée le Grand, bâtisseur d'empire*, Bruxelles 1954, 58-59; E. Badian, *Foreign clientelae (264-70 B.C.)*, Oxford 1958, 270; Crawford 1974, 83 (cf. note 4); J. Leach, *Pompey the Great*, London 1978, 28; A. Keaveney, *Young Pompey: 106-79 BC*, «AntCl» 51, 1982, 122-123 (111-139); R. Seager, *Pompey the Great. A Political Biography*, Oxford 2002, 27.

11 Plut.*Vit.Pomp*.13.4.5.

12 Despite the fact that he was named *Magnus* by his soldiers in Africa in 81 or welcomed with it by Sulla after his return from this campaigne (Plut.*Vit.Pomp*.13.4.5).

13 H. Castritius, *Zum Aureus mit dem Triumph des Pompeius*, «JNG» 21, 1971, 27.

14 Crawford 1974, 412-413 (cf. note 4).

15 Cic.*Leg.Man*.62; Cic.*Pis*.58; App.*BCiv*.1.121; Vell.Pat.2.30.2; Val.Max.8.15.8; Plut.*Vit.Crass*.11.8, *Vit.Pomp*.22.1, 23.2; Plin.*HN*.7.95-96; Flor.2.10.9; Dio Cass.36.25.3; Eutrop.6.5.2.

16 CH. Battenberg, *Pompeius und Caesar. Persönlichkeit und Programm in ihrer Münzpropaganda*, Marburg 1980, 7-8.

17 Battenberg tries to convince that Pompey did not want to celebrate a victory over fellow citizens and because of that he used the personification of Africa. The main problem with his interpretation is that the war on Sicily and in Africa was also a part of civil war and after the victory Pompey did not hesitate to celebrate it.

18 Plut.*Vit.Sert*.27.2-3.

19 L. Amela Valverde, *El áureo de Cn. Pompeyo Magno (RRC 402), acuñados en Amisos (Ponto)*, «GacNum» 140, 2001, 8.

20 Long discussion on the subject of the date of birth of Pompey's sons cf. M. Hadas, *Sextus Pompey*, New York 1966, 3-9 who concludes based on the analysis of Appianus that it was Sextus Pompey who was born ca. 75, therefore Gnaeus must have been born earlier in 79. Nonetheless modern scholars tend to believe more the testimony of Velleius Paterculus that Sextus was born ca 67 and his elder brother ca 75, cf. B.A. Marshal, *The engagement of Faustus Sulla and Pompeia*, «AncSoc» 18, 1987, 100.

21 D. Michel, *Alexander als Vorbild für Pompeius, Caesar und Marcus Antonius*, Bruxelles 1967, 39-40.

22 There is possibility, although not very likely, that the coin in question was struck with the connection of the Gabinian (Cic.*Leg.Man*.44; Plut.*Vit.Pomp*.26.2; Dio Cass. 36.23.4) or Manilian (Cic.*Mur*.34; Cic.*Leg.Man*; Vell.Pat.2.33.1; Plut.*Vit.Pomp*.30.1-2; Livy *Per*.100; Eutrop.6.12; Oros.6.4.3) laws. In this case, the coin would remind of his previous victories for the purpose of passing those laws.

23 Castritius 1971, 30 (cf. note 13).

24 Amela Valverde 2001a, 10-11 (cf. note 19).

25 Plut.*Vit.Pomp*.45.4; Plin.*HN*.37.16; App.*Mith*.116.

26 R. Stewart, *The 'jug' and 'lituus' on Roman Republican Coin Types. Ritual Symbols and Political Power*, «Phoenix» 51, 1997, 180 (170-189).

27 cf. Castritius 1971, 29-30 (cf. note 13).

28 Castritius 1971, 29 (cf. note 13).

29 Vell.Pat.2.40.3; Plut.*Vit.Pomp*. 43.2; Dio Cass.37.20.6; App.*Mith*. 116.566.

30 RRC 426/3 and RRC 426/4 though there are several issues that can be connected with Pompey with varying degrees of probability – mainly RRC 436, RRC 442. More on these coins, cf.: K. Kopij, *The Coins Related to Pompey the Great through the Lens of the Theology of Victory,* in *Proceedings of the 6th international numismatic congress in Croatia,* Zadar, 26-29 september 2010, Rijeka 2011, 141-150; K. Kopij, *Propaganda on the Coinage Related to Pompey the Great*, «Notae Numismaticae-Zapiski Numizmatyczne» 6 2012, 47-62.

31 More on the Theatre of Pompey with subsequent bibliography, cf.: K. Kopij, *Opera Pompei and the theology of victory*, «Studies in Ancient Art and Civilization» 14, 2010, 167-178.

32 Plin.*HN*.7.97.

33 L. Richardson JR., *A New Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London 1992, 255; S. Weinstock, *Victor and invictus*, «HarvTheolR» 50, 1957, 228-229.

34 Plin.*HN*.34.57; cf. S.B. Platner – TH. Ashby, *A Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, London 1929, 255-256; Richardson 1992, 187-188 (cf. note 33).

35 Plut.*Vit.Pomp*.52.4; Dio Cass.39.38.1-3.

36 Plin.*HN*.7.3.34, 35.37.114, 36.4.41.

37 cf. Kopij 2010, 167-178 (cf. note 30).

38 Mattingly 1963, 51 (cf. note 7); Castritius 1971, 32 (cf. note 13).

39 RRC 446.

40 RRC 447.

41 A. Alföldi, *Iuba I. und die Pompeianer in Afrika*, «SchwMüBl» 32, 1958, 103-108.

42 Castritius 1971, 32-34 (cf. note 13).

43 Amela Valverde 2001a, 8-9 (cf. note 19); Amela Valverde 2010, 211 (cf. note 5).

44 Castritius 1971, 34 (cf. note 13).

45 With the weight little bit less than 9 g. The specimen from the British Museum is 8.94 g (cf. E. Ghey – I. Leins – M.H. Crawford (eds.), *A catalogue of the Roman republican coins in the British Museum, with descriptions and chronology based on M.H. Crawford, Roman republican coinage (1974)*, London 2010, no. 402.1.1).

46 RRC 451 (the heavier of Caesar's *áurei*, with the weight ca. 8.55 g); RRC 456. RRC 466, RRC 475, RRC 481 (all ca. 8 g). cf. C.H.V. Sutherland, *General introduction*, in *The Roman Imperial coinage,* I, *From 31 BC to AD 69*, Sutherland, C.H.V., Carson, R.A.G. (eds.), London 1984, 3-5; B.E. Woytek, *The denarius coinage of the Roman Republic,* in *The Oxford handbook of Greek and Roman coinage*, Metcalf, W. (ed.), Oxfrod 2012, 321-322.

47 G.F. Hill, *Historical Roman coins from the earliest times to the reign of Augustus*, London 1909, 98.

48 Amela Valverde 2010, 208 (cf. note 5).

49 Cf. M. Jatta, *Le rappresentanze figurate delle province romane*, Roma 1908, 30-34, figs. 6-8; J.M.C. Toynbee, *The Hadrianic school. A chapter in the history of Greek art*, Cambridge 1934, 36, pl. XXII, 4, XXIII, 1; J.A. Ostrowski, *Les personifications des provinces dans l'art romain*, Warszawa 1990, 81-99.

50 J.N. Svoronos, *Τά νομίσματα του κράτους των Πτολεμαίων*, I-IV, Athens 1904-1908, nos. 18-24.

51 A.J. Evans, *Contributions to Sicilian Numismatics*, «NumChron» 1894, 237-238, pl. 8, 6.

52 SNG Copenhagen, Sicily, pl. 4.172.

53 J.N. Svoronos, *Τά νομίσματα του κράτους των Πτολεμαίων*, I-IV, Athens 1904-1908, nos. 18-24.

54 Toynbee 1934, 35 (cf. note 49).

55 A.F. Stewart, *Faces of power. Alexander's image and Hellenistic politics*, Berkeley 1993, 234 with subsequent literature.

56 Stewart 1993, 234 (cf. note 55).

57 Stewart 1993, 234 (cf. note 55).

58 Ath.5.25.

59 Stewart 1993, 234 with subsequent literature and reference to other non-monetary artefacts (cf. note 55).

60 Stewart 1993, 235-236 (cf. note 55).

61 Stewart 1993, 236 (cf. note 55).

62 Stewart 1993, 236 (cf. note 55).

63 SNG Copenhagen, Sicily, pl. 4.172.

64 J.A. Maritz, *The image of Africa. The evidence of coinage*, «ActaCl» 44, 2001, 106.

65 Liv.19.

66 Although we have to keep in mind the *aes signatum* decorated with an elephant on the obverse and a sow on the reverse dated traditionally to the early 3rd century BC; cf. L. Morawiecki, *Początki mennictwa rzymskiego* [The beginnings of Roman coinage], Wrocław 1982, 7-10.

67 Maritz 2001, 107-108 (cf. note 64).

68 Maritz 2001, 108 (cf. note 64).

69 A.J. Evans, *Contributions to Sicilian numismatics* «NumChron» 14, 1894, 237-238, pl. 8,6.

70 Toynbee 1934, 35 (cf. note 49).

71 Maritz 2001, 108-109 (cf. note 64).

72 Stewart 1993, 268 (cf. note 53).

73 Stewart 1993, 268 (cf. note 53).

74 After Maritz 2001, 108-109 (cf. note 64).

75 Stewart 1993, 268 (cf. note 53); Michel 1967, 42-43 (cf. note 21): also lists a number of figures that may be referring to Alexander, esspecialy as a conqueror of India.

76 CNNM nos. 94, 95, 97, 98.

77 RRC 461.

78 CNNM no 93.

79 CNNM no 103, RPC 853.

80 RRC 491/1a.

81 RRC 509/3-4.

82 CNNM no. 108, cf. nos. 122-123.

83 e.g. J. Alexandropulos, *Les monnaies de l'Afrique antique, 400 av. J.-C. - 40 ap. J.-C.*, Toulouse 2007, no. 70, RPC 878, 881.

84 CNNM nos. 94, 95, 97, 98.

85 Maritz 2001, 111 (cf. note 64).

86 A passage from Pliny (*HN*.28.5.24) seems to indicate that such an indigenous concept existed as *Dea Africa*.

87 Maritz 2001, 111-112 (cf. note 64).

88 RRC 461.

89 Ostrowski 1990, 93-94 (cf. note 49).

90 Maritz 2001, 113-114 (cf. note 64).

91 Maritz 2001, 113-114 (cf. note 64).

92 CNNM no. 93.

93 CNNM no. 103, RPC 853.

94 RRC 491/1a.

95 RRC 509/3-4.

96 Maritz 2001, p. 116 (cf. note 64.)

97 Dio Cass.48.17.6.

98 CNNM no. 108, cf. nos. 122-123.

99 e.g. J. Alexandropulos, *Les monnaies de l'Afrique antique, 400 av. J.-C. - 40 ap. J.-C.*, Toulouse 2007, no. 70, RPC 878, 881.

100 RPC 5289.

101 The catalogue of nonmonetary artifacts can be found in Jatta 1908, 30 (no. 8), 31 (nos. 9-12), 32 (nos. 13-14), 33 (nos. 20-24), 34 (nos. 25-27), figs. 6, 7, 8 (cf. note 49); supplemented by Toynbee 1934, p. 36, pl. XXII, 4, XXIII, 1 (cf. note 49). Newer and more comprehensive catalogue can be found in: Ostrowski 1990, 81-92 with a commentary, 92-99 (cf. note 49).

102 cf. Ostrowski 1990, 92-99, especially 95 (cf. note 49).

103 Maritz 2001, 119-125 (cf. note 64).

104 e.g. Masinissa (CNNM no. 17), Jughurta (CNNM nos. 73-75), Juba (CNNM nos. 91-92).

105 Just.*Epit*.12.8.

106 P. Gardner, *New Greek coins of Bactria and India*, «NumChron» 7, 1887, 177; M.J. Price, *The 'Porus' coinage of Alexander the Great. A symbol of concord and community"*, in *Studia Paulo Naster Oblata* I, Orientalia Louvaniensia 12, S Scheers, (ed.) Leuven 1982, 75-88. R.J. Lane Fox, *Text and image. Alexander the Great, coins and elephants*, «BICS» 41, 1996, 88 [87-108], no. 3; M.J. Olbrycht, *On coin portraits of Alexander the Great and his Iranian regalia. Some remarks ocassioned by the book by F. Smith «L'immagine di Alessandro il Grande sulle monete del regno (336-323)»*, «Notae Numismaticae-Zapiski Numizmatyczne» 6, 2011, 18-21.

107 Price 1982, 81-82 (cf. note 106).

108 Lane Fox 1996, 91-94 (cf. note 106); Olbrycht 2011, 20-21 (cf. note 106).

109 Lane Fox 1996, 88, no. 4 (cf. note 106).

110 Olbrycht 2011, 20-21 argues that bowmen both on foot as well as on chariot may have been references rather to Iranian archers than to the Indians and the coins were an expression of the unity between the Macedonians and the Iranians who fought shoulder to shoulder against Indians and thus of the unity the Alexander's empire (cf. note 106).

111 Lane Fox 1996, 88-89, no. 5 (cf. note 106).

112 SC 101.1-2.

113 SC no. 183.

114 SC no. 188-189, 222.

115 SC no. 1696.

116 SC no. 1989.

117 SC no. 2234.

118 SC nos. 1224-1225.

119 A.C. Smith, *Personification in art*, in *The Oxford encyclopedia of ancient Greece and Rome*, 1, Gagarin, M. (ed.), Oxford 2010, 228.

120 In the Seleucid coinage we find: a) an elephant on reverses: e.g. SC nos. 1, 1.2, 35, 128-129, 187, 265 (Seleucus I); nos. 365, 400 (Antioch I); nos. 800-801, 817-821 (Seleucus II); nos. 976, 985-987, 976-981, 1035-1036, 1065-1068, 1084-1090, 1093, 1170, 1293 (Antioch III); nos. 1353-1356 (Seleucus IV); nos. 1554-1555 (Antioch IV); no. 1607 (Timarchus); no. 1791 (Alexander I); no. 2006 (Antioch VI); b) a chariot drawn by elephants: e.g. nos. 130-133, 155-159, 163, 177-180, 257, 259 (Seleucus I); c) an elephant's head: e.g. nos. 180-181 (Seleucus I), nos. 1371, 1407, 1421-1422 (Antioch IV), no. 1646 (Demetrius I), no. 2243 (Alexander II); d) an elephant with a rider: e.g. nos. 1872, 1876 (Alexander I).

121 As well as of the fact that those ferocious animals were used as war machines.

122 e.g. *Corpus of Indo-Greek coins*, Lahiri, A.N. (ed.), Calcuta 1965, pl. XI.7-11.

123 e.g. *Corpus of Indo-Greek coins*, Lahiri, A.N. (ed.), Calcuta 1965, pl. XXIII.4.

124 e.g. a) an elephant: O. Bopearachchi, *Sylloge nummorum graecorum. The collection of the American Numismatic Society* IX. *Graeco-Bactrian and Indo-Greek coins*, New York 1998 (= SNG ANS 9), nos. 299-302, M. Mitchiner, *Oriental coins. the Ancient and Classical World*, London 1978, no. 1754, D. R. Sear, *Greek Coins and their values,* II. *Asia and Africa*, London 1979, no. 7591 (Apollodotos I), SNG ANS 9, 1048 (Lysias), SNG ANS 9, 1066, no. 7629 (Antialkides); b) elephant's head: no. 7616, SNG ANS 9, 915-933 (Menander); c) elephant's protome: SNG ANS 9, 1098-1103 (Antialkides).

125 e.g. elephant's head: R.C. Senior, *Indo-Scythian coins and history*, Lancaster 2001, no. 5.1 (Maues); an elephant: IDEM type 15 (Maues), IDEM type 100 (Azes II).

126 Maritz 2001, 113 (cf. note 64).

127 Amela Valverde 2001a, 12 (cf. note 19); Amela Valverde 2010, 212-213 (cf. note 5).

128 Maritz 2001, 113 (cf. note 64).

129 Amela Valverde 2010, 212-213 (cf. note 5).

130 cf. Cic.*Att*.1.18.6; Vell.Pat.2.40.4; Dio Cass.37.21.4.

131 It becomes very popular as one of emperor's titles in the third century, cf. M. Beard, *The Roman triumph*, London 2007, 374, note 4.

132 RRC 426/4.

133 SIG^3 749A; *IDélos* 1641, L. Amela Valverde, *Pompeyo y los honores cultuales. Algunos casos*, in *Jerarquías religiosas y control social en el mundo antiguo,* actas del XXVII Congreso Internacional Girea-Arys IX, Valladolid, 7-9 de noviembre 2002, Alvar Ezquerra, J., Hernández Guerra, L. (eds.), Valladolid 2004, 409-410.

134 This *thiasos* is also mentioned in another inscription from Delos (*IDélos* 1797).

135 L. Amela Valverde, *Inscriptiones honoríficas dedicadas a Pompeyo Magno*, «Faventia» 23, 2001, 89; L. Amela Valverde, *Pompeyo Magno y Atenas*, «Polis» 17, 2005, 11.

136 e.g.: Argos: AE.1920.81; Claros: J.-L. Ferrary, *Les inscriptions du sanctuaire de Claros en l'honneur des Romains, BCH* (Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique) 124, 2000, 341 [331-376]. 341; Demetraie: IG.IX.2.1134; Ilium: *AE* 1990.940, *SEG* XLVI.1565; Milet: SIG, p. 407, *Arch.Anz.*1906, p. 21; Miletopolis: SEG.XVII.525; Mytilene: AE 1971.453, IG.XII.2.140, 141, 142, 144, 145, 146, 163, 165, 202, SIG^3.693; Samos: AE 1912.215; Soli-Pompeiopolis (AE 1888.106).

137 e.g. Inscription from Claros (Ferrary, 2000, 341) and Miletopolis (SEG.XVII.525).

138 A. Momigliano, *Terra marique*, «JRS» 32, 1942, 63; M. Kajava, *Honorific and other dedications to emperors in the Greek East*, in *Less Than Gods, More Than Men*, P. Iossif *et al*. (eds.), Leuven 2011, 587 [553-592].

139 A.H.M. Jones, *The cities of the eastern Roman provinces*, Oxford 1937, 203.

140 A.H.M. Jones 1937, 260 (cf. note 139); A. Kasher, *Jews and Hellenistic cities in Eretz-Israel. Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Hellenistic cities during the second temple period (332 BCE - 70 CE)*, Tubingen 1990, 175-176.

141 However O.D. Hoover, *Handbook of Syrian coins. Royal and civic issues, fourth to first centuries BC*, Lancaster/London 2009, LXV-LXVI, argues that they counted time not so much according to Pompeian era as rather autonomous civic eras.

142 *IG* XII2.59.

143 *AE* 1966.462; *IK* 43.54; Amela Valverde 2004a, 415 (cf. note 133).

144 We must remember though that the inscription is only partially preserved and thus several interpretations exist, most of them, however, agree that the text refers to Pompey, cf. L. Amela Valverde, *Dedicatoria a Pompeyo procedente de Side (AE 1966, 462 = IK 43, 54 = I. Side 101)*, «Sylloge Epigraphica Barcienonensis» 5, 2004, 12-17.

145 *IG* IX 1^2.3.719; *SEG* XII 270. The inscription can be seen at: http://epigraphy.packhum.org/inscriptions/main?url=oi%3Fikey%3D43617%26bookid%3D9%26region%3D3 cf. Amela Valverde 2004a, 411-412 (cf. note 133).

146 cf. Amela Valverde 2004a, 407-416 (cf. note 133).

147 BMC Pontus, no. 83.

148 BMC Pontus, Nicaea nos. 1, 5; SNG Deutschland, Pontus, Paphlagonien, Bithynien, Nikaia no. 533.

149 BMC Pontus, Nicomedia no. 2, 5; SNG Deutschland, Pontus, Paphlagonien, Bithynien, Nikomedia no. 736; SNG Deutschland, Supplement, Nikomedia no. 7099.

150 SNG Copenhagen, Prusa ad Olympum, nos. 583-584.

151 The governor in 56 BC: T.R.S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* II. *99-31 BC*, New York 1952, 210.

152 The governor in the years 61-59: Broughton 1952, 181. 185. 191 (cf. note 151).

153 Battenberg 1980, 29 (cf. note 16).

154 BMC Pontus, Amisos, no. 83; BMC Pontus, Nicaea no. 5; SNG Deutschland, Pontus, Paphlagonien, Bithynien, Nikomedia no. 736 and *SNG Copenhagen,* Prusa, nos. 583-584.

155 BMC Pontus, Nicomedia, nos. 2, 4.

156 BMC Pontus, Nicaea, nos. 1, 5; SNG Deutschland, Pontus, Paphlagonien, Bithynien, Nikaia no. 533.

157 Cic.*Flacc.*60: «They called Mithridates a god, they called him their father and the preserver of Asia, they called him Evius, Nysius, Bacchus, Liber.» (Cicero, *Orations. In Catilinam 1-4. Pro Murena. Pro Sulla. Pro Flacco*, trans. Macdonald, C., Harvard 1976).

158 Battenberg 1980, 30-32 (cf. note 16).

159 On one of the inscriptions from Ilium (*AE* 1990.940) Pompey is praised as «the one who liberated the people from the war with the barbarians», cf. L. Amela Valverde, *Una inscripción de Ilium dedicata a Pompeyo. Una nota*, «Antigüedad religiones y sociedades» 7, 2006-2008, 115-128.

160 SNG Deutschland, Pontus, Paphlagonien, Bithynien, Nikaia no. 533.

161 Battenberg 1980, 31 (cf. note 16).

162 RRC 549, Crawford 1974, 544-545 (cf. note 4). In assigning a coin to a date and a mint there was a discussion but now it is widely (cf. RRC 544-545; L. Amela Valverde, *RRC 549, estatera emitada por Cn. Cornelio Lentulo Marcellino*, «GacNum» 150, 2003, 3-11 accepted that it was struck during Marcellinus' governorship of Syria (ca. 59), probably in Antioch.

163 RRC 548.

164 Hill 1909, 97-98 (cf. note 47).

165 Hill did not elaborate what circumstances he meant.

166 Sal.*H.*2.98; Plut.*Vit.Pomp.*20.1.

167 cf. R. Syme, *The Roman Revolution*, Oxford 1939, 20; Badian 1958, 279-282 (cf. note 10); A. Ward, *Cicero and Pompey in 75 and 70*, «Latomus» 29, 1970, 64.

168 cf. T.P. Hillman, *Pompeius and the Senate: 77-70*, «Hermes» 118, 1990, 445-446.

169 Sall.*H.*2.44.7.

170 Sall.*H.*2.42.

171 Sall.*H.*2.82.9.

172 Broughton 1952, 103 (cf. note 151); Both Crawford 1974 (cf. note 4) and CH. Hersh – A. Walker, *The Mesagne Hoard*, «ANSMusNotes» 29, 1984, tab. 2 dated Lentulus' issues to 76-75 BC; M. Harlan, *Roman Republican moneyers and their coins, 81 BCE to 64 BCE*, Citrus Heights 2012, pp. 83-91) proposed to change the date to 74-73, arguing that EX S.C on Lentulus' coins mean that he was sent by the Senate in response to Pompey's letters.

173 RRC 444, 445/1, 445/2, 445/3 and possibly RRC 440-441.

174 RRC 446, 447. There is no consensus on the place of production: Crawford 1974, 463 (cf. note 4) and Battenberg 1980, 82-85 argue for Pompey's camp (cf. note 16); Alföldi 1958, 106 (cf. note 41) proposed Africa and Spanish scholars: A. Beltrán Martínez, *Monedas de personajes pompeyanos en relación con Cartagena*, in *Crónica del I Congreso Nacional de Arqueología, Murcia 1. 1949, y del V Congreso Arqueológico del Sudeste, Murcia 5. 1949*, Alamería 2010, 248; L. Villaronga, *Numismatica antigua de Hispania. Inicación a su estudio*, Barcelona 1979, 239; L. Amela Valverde, *La amodenación pompeyana en Hispania. Su utilización como medio propagandístico y como reflejo de la clientela de la gens Pompeia*, «Faventia» 12/13, 1990/1991, 181-184, L. Amela Valverde, *Emisiones militares pompeyanas del año 49 en Hispania*, «Historia Antigua» 15 2004, 171-175; L. Villaronga – J. Benages, *Ancient coinage of the Iberian Peninsula. Greek, Punic, Iberian, Roman*, Barcelona 2011, 686.

175 Crawford 1974, 467 (cf. note 4).